

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

JI YUN LEE,

Petitioner,

-against-

FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS, et al.,

Respondents.

22-cv-4476 (JLR) (OTW)

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT  
AND RECOMMENDATION**

JENNIFER L. ROCHON, United States District Judge:

This petition for a writ of habeas corpus was referred to Magistrate Judge Wang for a Report and Recommendation. *See* Docket No. 18. In the Report and Recommendation filed on August 18, 2023, Magistrate Judge Wang recommended that the petition be dismissed as moot. *See* Docket No. 20.

In reviewing a Report and Recommendation, a district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). A district court “must determine *de novo* any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); *see also United States v. Male Juvenile*, 121 F.3d 34, 38 (2d Cir. 1997). To accept those portions of the report to which no timely objection has been made, however, a district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record. *See, e.g., Wilds v. United Parcel Serv.*, 262 F. Supp. 2d 163, 169 (S.D.N.Y. 2003). This clearly erroneous standard also applies when a party makes only conclusory or general objections, or simply reiterates his original arguments. *See, e.g., Ortiz v. Barkley*, 558 F. Supp. 2d 444, 451 (S.D.N.Y. 2008).

In the present case, the Report and Recommendation advised the parties that they had fourteen days from service of the Report and Recommendation to file any objections, and warned that failure to timely file such objections would result in waiver of any right to object.

*See* Docket No. 20. In addition, the Report and Recommendation expressly called Petitioner's attention to Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).


Nevertheless, as of the date of this Order, no objections have been filed and no request for an extension of time to object has been made. Accordingly, Petitioner has waived the right to object to the Report and Recommendation or to obtain appellate review. *See Frank v. Johnson*, 968 F.2d 298, 300 (2d Cir. 1992); *see also Caidor v. Onondaga County*, 517 F.3d 601 (2d Cir. 2008).

Despite the waiver, the Court has reviewed the petition and the Report and Recommendation, unguided by objections, and finds the Report and Recommendation to be well reasoned and grounded in fact and law. Because Petitioner was released from home confinement on August 26, 2022, and is no longer in the custody of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, his petition is moot. *See Pugh v. Goord*, 571 F. Supp. 2d 477, 489 (S.D.N.Y. 2008) (citing *Hallett v. N.Y. State Dep't of Corr. Servs.*, 109 F. Supp. 2d 190, 196 (S.D.N.Y. 2000)). Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation is ADOPTED in its entirety.

The Clerk of Court is directed to terminate Docket No. 2, close the case, and mail a copy of this Order to Petitioner.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 8, 2023  
New York, New York

  
JENNIFER L. ROCHON  
United States District Judge